Classical Anarchism in Theory and Practice: Mikhail Bakunin, Peter Kropotkin, Errico Malatesta, Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman, and Luigi Fabbri

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

January 25, 2026

This paper traces a lineage of classical anarchist thought through six figures whose lives spanned revolution, exile, censorship, imprisonment, and relentless organizing. Read together, Bakunin, Kropotkin, Malatesta, Goldman, Berkman, and Fabbri offer more than a catalogue of anti-state slogans. They present a coherent moral and strategic challenge to coercive authority in all its forms, while also disagreeing—sometimes sharply—about how a free society could be built and defended. The core tension is enduring: how to pursue liberation without recreating domination, how to coordinate collective action without a new ruling class, and how to answer violence by states without making violence a governing principle. By moving between biography and doctrine, the paper shows how each thinker's context shaped their emphasis: Bakunin's insurgent collectivism, Kropotkin's mutual aid and anarchist communism, Malatesta's pragmatic revolutionary organizing, Goldman's fusion of personal freedom with political revolt, Berkman's prison-honed critique of punishment and power, and Fabbri's anti-fascist clarity on authoritarian drift. The goal is a map of ideas that still structure debates about freedom, organization, and revolutionary ethics today.

Keywords: classical anarchism, collectivist anarchism, anarchist communism, mutual aid, anti-statism, anti-capitalism, revolutionary praxis, syndicalism, propaganda of the deed, prefigurative politics, direct action, federation, authority, coercion, prisons, political violence, labor movement, feminism, free speech, anti-fascism, exile.

A collaboration with GPT-4o and GPT-5.2-Thinking. 31 pages. CC4.0.

Outline

1. Introduction: Why These Six Still Matter
1.1 A shared anti-authoritarian core
1.2 The recurring dilemma: liberation without new domination
1.3 Method: biography as a lens on doctrine and strategy

2. Historical Terrain of Classical Anarchism
2.1 Industrial capitalism, empire, and the modern state
2.2 The First International, socialist splits, and anarchist formation
2.3 Policing, exile networks, and the politics of repression

3. The Common Commitments
3.1 Anti-statism and the critique of political authority
3.2 Anti-capitalism and the critique of property and wage labor
3.3 Voluntary association, federation, and self-management
3.4 Means-end consistency and prefigurative ethics

4. Core Fault Lines Among Anarchists
4.1 Collectivism vs communism: property, distribution, and transition
4.2 Organization vs spontaneity: parties, unions, affinity groups
4.3 Violence, insurrection, and the moral limits of force
4.4 The problem of "the revolution" becoming a new state

5. Mikhail Bakunin: Insurrectionary Collectivism and Anti-Authoritarian Socialism
5.1 Freedom against metaphysical and political authority
5.2 Class struggle, peasant revolts, and revolutionary rupture
5.3 Federalism, the danger of elites, and anti-statist strategy

6. Peter Kropotkin: Mutual Aid, Anarchist Communism, and Social Ecology
6.1 Mutual aid as a counter-theory of social order
6.2 From scientific metaphors to political economy
6.3 Decentralization, cooperation, and the architecture of freedom

7. Errico Malatesta: Pragmatic Revolution and the Discipline of Organizing
7.1 Insurrectionary orientation without romanticism
7.2 Organization as a safeguard against drift and defeat
7.3 Reform, compromise, and the boundary between tactics and surrender

8. Emma Goldman: Personal Liberation, Speech, and Revolutionary Culture
8.1 Freedom as lived practice, not future promise
8.2 Feminism, sexuality, and the critique of respectability politics
8.3 War, conscription, and the state's claim over the body

9. Alexander Berkman: Prisons, Punishment, and the Anatomy of Coercion
9.1 Carceral power as a model of the state
9.2 Radicalization, remorse, and political maturation
9.3 Revolutionary ethics under repression and surveillance

10. Luigi Fabbri: Anti-Fascism, Authoritarian Drift, and Movement Self-Critique
10.1 Fascism as a warning about crisis politics
10.2 The state form as a recurring temptation
10.3 Lessons on strategy, narrative, and institutional capture

11. A Comparative Synthesis: What Converges, What Diverges
11.1 A matrix of views: organization, economy, violence, culture
11.2 Where their arguments complement each other
11.3 Where their disagreements remain structurally unresolved

12. Contemporary Relevance: Re-reading Classical Anarchism Today
12.1 Horizontalism, networks, and modern movement forms
12.2 Mutual aid in crisis politics and community resilience
12.3 Speech, policing, prisons, and the post-9/11 security state
12.4 The standing challenge: power that returns in new disguises

13. Conclusion: The Anarchist Test
13.1 The standard: does the method reproduce domination
13.2 A realistic utopianism: institutions that cannot harden into rulers
13.3 What these six teach about courage, error, and endurance

14. References

Art

1. Introduction: Why These Six Still Matter

The six figures examined in this paper—Mikhail Bakunin, Peter Kropotkin, Errico Malatesta, Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman, and Luigi Fabbri—stand as pillars of classical anarchist thought. Their ideas shaped not only the intellectual lineage of anarchism but also its lived strategies in response to capitalism, state violence, patriarchy, imperialism, and fascism. Though they operated in different historical contexts and emphasized different tactics, their writings and actions continue to resonate in movements grappling with how to resist domination without reproducing it. In the face of renewed authoritarianism, surveillance, ecological crisis, and capitalist consolidation, their visions of horizontal power and voluntary cooperation offer a counterpoint both radical and sobering.

1.1 A Shared Anti-Authoritarian Core

All six thinkers grounded their politics in a fundamental rejection of imposed authority—whether political, economic, religious, or cultural. This anti-authoritarian ethic was not an abstract principle; it was woven into practical opposition to the centralized state, institutionalized religion, wage labor, prisons, conscription, and the normalization of hierarchy in everyday life. They understood coercion not just as physical violence, but as a structural condition that stifled autonomy, solidarity, and creativity. From Bakunin's opposition to Marxist statism, to Goldman's rejection of moralism as social control, each held to a moral commitment that no freedom can be granted from above—it must be taken and practiced from below.

1.2 The Recurring Dilemma: Liberation Without New Domination

Their shared critique of authority did not lead to doctrinal unity. Instead, it forced engagement with one of the central dilemmas of revolutionary politics: how to dismantle oppressive structures without rebuilding them under new names. Could a revolution be both effective and ethically consistent? Could social coordination occur without central command? Could violence be justified in the name of peace? These thinkers did not always agree. Bakunin saw the potential of spontaneous uprising and mass revolt, while Malatesta emphasized structured organizing. Goldman and Berkman were drawn into the contradictions of armed resistance and state repression in Russia, while Fabbri wrote of fascism as the logical consequence of authoritarian shortcuts. Their differences reveal a movement constantly in tension between strategy and integrity.

1.3 Method: Biography as a Lens on Doctrine and Strategy

This paper uses a biographical approach not to romanticize these figures, but to show how their lives shaped—and were shaped by—their theories. They were not armchair philosophers but participants in revolutions, mutinies, exiles, and educational experiments. Each was forced to confront the limits of their ideals through concrete struggle: in prisons, courtrooms,

underground newspapers, labor strikes, and exiled communities. This interplay between lived experience and political vision is crucial to understanding their work. For anarchism is not only a doctrine—it is a set of questions posed through action. Their biographies offer a window into how anarchist principles evolve under pressure, and how personal failure or perseverance can feed back into movement theory. The result is not a unified program but a dynamic field of political possibility.

2. Historical Terrain of Classical Anarchism

To understand the formation and development of classical anarchism, one must situate it within the epochal shifts of the 19th and early 20th centuries. This was a period marked by the rise of industrial capitalism, the consolidation of the modern nation-state, the intensification of imperial expansion, and the birth of organized socialist movements. These structural transformations created both the material conditions and the political antagonisms that anarchism would seek to confront. The thinkers examined in this paper were not isolated visionaries—they emerged from and responded to these seismic forces, attempting to forge a revolutionary path that rejected both capitalist domination and statist alternatives.

2.1 Industrial Capitalism, Empire, and the Modern State

The 19th century witnessed a dramatic transformation in economic and political life. Industrial capitalism surged across Europe and North America, creating vast urban working classes and unprecedented wealth disparities. Factory systems imposed brutal discipline on workers, while land enclosures and economic dislocation uprooted rural communities. Alongside these changes came the modern bureaucratic state, increasingly centralized, militarized, and interventionist. Infrastructure, education, policing, and taxation systems were expanded not only to manage industrial economies but also to facilitate imperial conquest abroad and social control at home.

This dual rise—of capitalism and the modern state—formed the primary target of anarchist critique. Thinkers like Bakunin and Kropotkin saw in the fusion of economic and political power a form of total domination that could not be reformed from within. The liberal state, in their view, masked a deeper coercion: wage labor as a form of economic servitude and law as a means of enforcing elite interests. Empire was not simply a foreign project but a mirror of domestic hierarchy. The anarchist insistence on dismantling both capital and state emerged not from abstraction but from lived experience in an era of intensifying structural violence.

2.2 The First International, Socialist Splits, and Anarchist Formation

The International Workingmen's Association (First International), founded in 1864, was a pivotal site of early socialist collaboration and eventual divergence. Anarchists and Marxists initially

worked side by side, united by opposition to capitalist exploitation and a belief in international worker solidarity. But strategic and philosophical differences soon fractured the alliance. Bakunin, a leading figure in the International's anti-authoritarian wing, clashed with Karl Marx over the role of the state in post-revolutionary society. While Marxists advocated for the seizure of state power as a transitional measure toward communism, Bakunin warned that such power would inevitably reproduce new forms of oppression.

The resulting split in 1872 marked the formal emergence of anarchism as a distinct current within the broader socialist tradition. The anarchists rejected state centralization, party hierarchy, and political representation in favor of decentralized federation, direct action, and prefigurative politics. This break was not merely theoretical; it reoriented movement infrastructure, leading to new publications, congresses, and alliances that solidified anarchism as an autonomous force. The legacy of this schism remains a defining feature of leftist strategy debates to this day.

2.3 Policing, Exile Networks, and the Politics of Repression

Anarchism's rejection of all dominant institutions made its adherents targets of intense repression. Governments across Europe and the Americas viewed anarchists as dangerous subversives, especially following a series of high-profile assassinations and bombings attributed—rightly or wrongly—to anarchist circles. The resulting crackdown was transnational in scope: deportations, censorship, bans on publications, surveillance, imprisonment, and infiltration were common tactics used to neutralize the movement.

This repression had two paradoxical effects. First, it internationalized anarchism. Exiled thinkers like Malatesta, Goldman, and Berkman developed complex transnational networks, moving between Italy, France, England, the U.S., and Latin America. These exile circuits became laboratories of theory and strategy, as well as mutual aid hubs. Second, repression radicalized many anarchists, sharpening their critiques of the state and leading some—especially in the late 19th century—to embrace "propaganda of the deed," the idea that direct action, even violent, could inspire revolutionary consciousness.

In response, many anarchists began to focus more on education, union organizing, and cultural work as alternative forms of resistance. The memory of repression—of comrades jailed, hanged, or silenced—remained central to anarchist political identity, reinforcing both a deep suspicion of institutional politics and a commitment to resistance as a moral imperative. The historical terrain in which classical anarchism developed was thus one of constant negotiation between utopian vision, organizational need, and the brute force of state power.

3. The Common Commitments

Despite their differences in emphasis, geography, and strategy, the six anarchists examined in this paper shared a set of foundational commitments that defined classical anarchism as a distinct tradition. These commitments went beyond opposition to particular injustices; they reflected a structural and moral vision of a society organized without domination. Their critique was totalizing—not in the sense of a rigid blueprint, but as a consistent rejection of coercive systems in all domains of life. Anarchism, for them, was not merely an ideology but a method of life and struggle grounded in freedom, solidarity, and dignity.

3.1 Anti-Statism and the Critique of Political Authority

At the heart of classical anarchism lies a principled opposition to the state as a structure of centralized coercive power. While other radical traditions saw the state as a potential instrument of emancipation, anarchists viewed it as inherently hierarchical and unredeemable. Bakunin warned that even a revolutionary state would reproduce a new ruling class—what he called a "red bureaucracy." Malatesta saw state power as the institutionalization of violence, regardless of its political orientation. For Goldman, the state was not just a system of administration, but a cultural apparatus that normalized obedience and punishment. Across their writings, these figures identified the state's monopoly on violence, its separation from the people, and its bureaucratic inertia as profound obstacles to human flourishing. They envisioned a stateless society not as chaos, but as a decentralized order based on mutual agreement and collective care.

3.2 Anti-Capitalism and the Critique of Property and Wage Labor

Closely intertwined with their critique of the state was a radical rejection of capitalism—not simply as an economic system, but as a moral and social pathology. Classical anarchists denounced private property in the means of production as legalized theft, a system in which wealth accumulates through the dispossession of labor. Kropotkin in particular emphasized that the wealth of society is the collective product of generations and should be held in common. Wage labor was understood not as a contract between equals, but as a coerced relationship in which the worker sells time and creative power under conditions of necessity. These thinkers did not call for redistribution through taxation or state welfare, but for the abolition of exploitative structures themselves. They sought to replace capitalist relations with forms of economic life based on use, need, cooperation, and access rather than profit and control.

3.3 Voluntary Association, Federation, and Self-Management

If the state and capitalism were illegitimate, what was to replace them? The anarchist answer was rooted in principles of voluntary association and horizontal organization. Rather than centralized command, anarchists proposed federations of self-managed communes,

cooperatives, and mutual aid networks. These associations would be entered into freely, governed from below, and subject to revision or withdrawal if they failed to serve their members. Bakunin imagined a “free federation of free communes,” while Kropotkin outlined how cooperative production and distribution could emerge organically from community-level organization. Malatesta emphasized the importance of coordination without coercion—an ongoing process of negotiation rather than fixed institutionalization. These structures were to be flexible, bottom-up, and pluralistic, allowing for the expression of local autonomy while cultivating interdependence and solidarity across communities.

3.4 Means-End Consistency and Prefigurative Ethics

One of the most distinctive and enduring features of classical anarchism is its insistence on the alignment between means and ends. Unlike ideologies that justify authoritarian methods as temporary necessities on the road to liberation, anarchists demanded that the process of struggle reflect the society they hoped to build. This ethic of prefiguration rejected manipulation, secrecy, and domination even in revolutionary contexts. Goldman was especially vocal on this point, warning that violence, hierarchy, or coercion within movements would inevitably poison their outcomes. Berkman, after participating in a failed assassination and enduring years in prison, came to express deep ambivalence about violent means disconnected from mass participation. Fabbri warned that movements risk becoming what they fight if they do not maintain internal democracy and moral clarity. Prefigurative politics thus became both a strategic safeguard and an ethical compass—anchoring anarchism in lived practice rather than utopian fantasy.

Taken together, these commitments formed a coherent foundation for classical anarchist thought. They offered not only a critique of existing institutions but also a set of guiding principles for building alternatives: freedom without domination, cooperation without coercion, and transformation without replication of the very power structures they sought to abolish.

4. Core Fault Lines Among Anarchists

Although unified in their opposition to coercive systems of power, classical anarchists were far from ideologically monolithic. Their disagreements were substantive and often passionately debated. These fault lines concerned not only theoretical differences but practical decisions about how to organize, how to confront state violence, and how to avoid reproducing domination in the process of revolution. Far from weakening the anarchist tradition, these debates reveal its seriousness—its refusal to settle for easy answers or rigid dogmas. Instead, classical anarchism continuously interrogated its own assumptions, a practice that allowed it to adapt to diverse contexts and avoid becoming merely a counter-doctrine to authoritarianism.

4.1 Collectivism vs Communism: Property, Distribution, and Transition

One of the central debates among anarchists was how to conceptualize and manage economic relations in a post-capitalist society. Mikhail Bakunin and his followers advocated for collectivist anarchism, in which property would be held collectively but individuals would be remunerated based on labor contribution. This approach sought to preserve the idea of fairness by aligning rewards with effort, while still rejecting private ownership of productive assets.

Peter Kropotkin, on the other hand, championed anarchist communism, which proposed the complete abolition of wage systems and redistribution based on need, not contribution. For Kropotkin, the complexity of human interdependence and the shared legacy of labor made any attempt to measure individual input both morally suspect and practically unworkable. Malatesta generally sided with the communist approach but emphasized that such economic forms must emerge voluntarily and experimentally, rather than be imposed as a rigid model.

The tension between these positions reflected deeper questions about human motivation, equity, and the feasibility of transition. Could a society maintain solidarity and productivity without material incentives? Would labor-based remuneration reproduce inequalities? The divide never fully closed, but anarchists generally agreed that coercion—whether in maintaining property or enforcing distribution models—was to be avoided at all costs.

4.2 Organization vs Spontaneity: Parties, Unions, Affinity Groups

Another enduring tension within anarchism concerned the question of organization. Should anarchists create formal structures, federations, and long-term institutions—or rely on spontaneous uprisings, informal networks, and flexible affinity groups? Bakunin saw great value in secret societies and revolutionary cells that could catalyze mass revolt. Malatesta, too, believed in organized anarchist groups to ensure ideological clarity and strategic coherence, though he cautioned against reproducing hierarchical leadership models.

In contrast, some currents, especially among later anarchists, emphasized spontaneity and direct, decentralized action as inherently more aligned with anarchist principles. They viewed formal organization as a slippery slope toward institutional ossification and internal coercion. Emma Goldman, while involved in organizations and publications, was deeply critical of groupthink and rigid structures that she felt dulled individual initiative and creativity.

This debate played out in relationships to unions and syndicalism as well. While some anarchists saw labor unions as vital vehicles for revolutionary change, others feared that union structures could become conservative or bureaucratic. The resolution, for many, was a commitment to federated and voluntary associations that maintained democratic accountability and could dissolve or evolve as needed. Still, the core challenge remained: how to coordinate sustained resistance without consolidating authority.

4.3 Violence, Insurrection, and the Moral Limits of Force

Perhaps the most volatile fault line concerned the use of violence. While all six figures acknowledged the brutal violence of the state and capitalist system, they differed on whether revolutionary violence was justified, and under what conditions. Bakunin was more open to insurrectionary tactics and believed in the power of popular uprisings to dismantle oppressive regimes. Kropotkin supported the idea of resistance but became increasingly skeptical of targeted violence as a political tool.

Goldman and Berkman's lives were marked by direct confrontations with this question. Berkman's failed assassination attempt against Henry Clay Frick—intended as a blow against capitalist tyranny—led to his imprisonment and eventual reevaluation of individual acts of violence. Goldman, while defending Berkman at the time, later became more nuanced, stressing that true revolution required a cultural and ethical transformation that violence could not achieve. Fabbri warned of the long-term dangers of elevating violence to a strategic norm, arguing that such tactics often strengthened state legitimacy and demoralized potential allies.

This debate was never fully resolved, but it helped shape a broader anarchist ethic: if violence is used, it must be defensive, transparent, and tightly constrained by accountability to the people—not a pathway to power or vengeance.

4.4 The Problem of "The Revolution" Becoming a New State

One of the deepest anxieties among classical anarchists was the possibility that a successful revolution could recreate the very structures it aimed to abolish. This fear was crystallized in the anarchist critique of Marxist-Leninist strategies, which advocated for the "dictatorship of the proletariat" as a transitional phase. Anarchists believed this would inevitably solidify into a new form of state oppression.

Bakunin famously predicted that Marx's revolutionary state would become a "despotism of a new kind," with intellectuals and bureaucrats as the new ruling elite. Malatesta warned that even temporary control could corrupt, especially when justified by appeals to efficiency or emergency. Goldman and Berkman witnessed this firsthand during the Russian Revolution. Initially supportive of the Bolsheviks, they became disillusioned by the repression of dissent, the centralization of power, and the betrayal of revolutionary ideals. Their writings from that period are powerful testimonies to the dangers of revolutionary betrayal.

Fabbri, writing in the context of rising fascism, added that authoritarianism can re-emerge in populist or even radical guises. The lesson drawn across these critiques was clear: the revolution must be ongoing—not a seizure of power, but a permanent process of dismantling power wherever it takes root. To guard against the state reappearing in new clothes, anarchists

stressed constant vigilance, radical decentralization, and a refusal to institutionalize coercion even in the name of progress.

5. Mikhail Bakunin: Insurrectionary Collectivism and Anti-Authoritarian Socialism

Mikhail Bakunin (1814–1876) was one of the founding figures of anarchist theory and a central architect of its political imagination. A former aristocrat turned revolutionary exile, Bakunin's thought emerged in direct confrontation with absolutist monarchy, state socialism, and capitalist exploitation. He was a powerful speaker and writer, known more for his visceral clarity and prophetic warnings than for systematized doctrine. Yet within his fragmented writings lies a coherent worldview grounded in the need for total emancipation—economic, political, and spiritual. His core contributions to anarchist thought revolve around three interlinked ideas: the rejection of metaphysical and political authority, the necessity of revolutionary rupture driven by class struggle, and a federated strategy designed to prevent the rise of new elites.

5.1 Freedom Against Metaphysical and Political Authority

Bakunin's conception of freedom was not merely the absence of restraint but the active realization of autonomy in collective life. He famously wrote that "the liberty of man consists in obeying no other man and in determining his acts only in accordance with his own convictions." But this liberty was under constant threat—not only from kings and politicians, but also from abstract metaphysical constructs such as God, morality, and science when they were deployed as absolute authorities. For Bakunin, all such hierarchies—whether celestial or earthly—were tools of domination when externalized and institutionalized.

His atheism was not just personal; it was political. He believed that the idea of God justified human servitude, and thus famously proclaimed, "If God really existed, it would be necessary to abolish Him." In this sense, Bakunin's critique of metaphysics was inseparable from his critique of the state and church: both placed individuals in positions of submission. True liberation, for Bakunin, required dismantling these illusions of authority and grounding knowledge, ethics, and decision-making in lived human experience.

5.2 Class Struggle, Peasant Revolts, and Revolutionary Rupture

While Bakunin's political philosophy was deeply theoretical, it was also steeped in revolutionary urgency. He did not believe capitalism or the state could be gradually reformed; he argued for an immediate and violent rupture with existing institutions. His revolutionary subject was not the urban industrial proletariat in the narrow Marxist sense, but a broader coalition of the exploited: landless peasants, unemployed workers, outcasts, and the marginalized. He believed that the revolutionary energy resided not in the bureaucratized sections of labor, but among

those who had nothing to lose and whose alienation from the system made them most ready to rebel.

Bakunin's theory of insurrection embraced spontaneity and uprising as legitimate and necessary. He opposed gradualism and parliamentary participation, believing that such engagement only served to legitimize the state. At the same time, he did not fetishize violence for its own sake. Rather, he saw it as a tragic but sometimes necessary response to systemic violence already in place. His vision was one of explosive, decentralized revolutions breaking out simultaneously in different regions, coordinated loosely but united in purpose: to destroy the old order and create the conditions for self-managed societies.

5.3 Federalism, the Danger of Elites, and Anti-Statist Strategy

Bakunin's great fear was that revolutionaries, once victorious, would form a new ruling class. His critique of Marxism was rooted in this insight. He believed that the "dictatorship of the proletariat," as proposed by Marx, would not wither away into stateless communism but would solidify into a new bureaucratic regime, ruled by intellectuals and party elites. He warned of the emergence of a "red bureaucracy" that would be more despotic than the regime it replaced. This insight proved prophetic, particularly in light of later 20th-century totalitarian socialist states.

To guard against this, Bakunin advocated for radical federalism as an alternative model of political organization. In his view, freedom could only be preserved through the decentralization of power into autonomous communes and federations, each retaining the right to secede or reconfigure based on the will of its members. These federations would be bound by mutual aid and solidarity, but not by coercive law. There would be no standing army, no centralized police, and no state apparatus—only voluntary associations governed by direct democracy.

Bakunin's legacy thus lies not only in his fierce denunciations but in his foresight. His insistence that revolutions must be designed to resist their own corruption remains one of the most enduring contributions to anti-authoritarian theory. By identifying both the psychological seduction of power and the structural dangers of centralized control, Bakunin laid the groundwork for anarchist critiques of all political movements that seek to "take power" rather than dissolve it. His blend of spiritual rebellion, revolutionary strategy, and decentralized vision remains foundational to the anarchist tradition.

6. Peter Kropotkin: Mutual Aid, Anarchist Communism, and Social Ecology

Peter Kropotkin (1842–1921) stands as one of the most influential theorists in the anarchist tradition, offering not only political philosophy but also an integrated vision of science, ethics,

and social organization. A Russian prince turned geographer and revolutionary, Kropotkin brought empirical grounding and moral optimism to anarchist theory. His contributions go beyond protest and critique; they include a positive framework for a decentralized, cooperative society rooted in solidarity, ecological balance, and shared abundance. Through his synthesis of natural science and political economy, Kropotkin made a profound case for a society without coercion and exploitation.

6.1 Mutual Aid as a Counter-Theory of Social Order

Kropotkin's most famous theoretical contribution is his formulation of *mutual aid* as a principle of social and evolutionary development. In direct response to the social Darwinist interpretations of his time—which emphasized "survival of the fittest" as competition and aggression—Kropotkin drew on his scientific observations in Siberia and elsewhere to argue that cooperation, not conflict, was the dominant survival strategy among species and human communities alike.

He emphasized that mutual aid is not only a biological tendency but a foundation of human society. From medieval guilds to peasant communes and indigenous social forms, Kropotkin showed that people had long relied on horizontal cooperation to endure hardship and build community. Far from being utopian or naïve, mutual aid was, in his view, a real and observable force that capitalism sought to suppress. He positioned this principle as both a moral imperative and an empirical truth, offering it as an alternative framework for understanding social evolution, ethics, and political potential.

6.2 From Scientific Metaphors to Political Economy

Kropotkin's background in geography and natural sciences deeply shaped his approach to political economy. Unlike many other radicals of his time, he did not begin from abstract class analysis or historical materialism alone. Instead, he embedded his economic vision in a naturalistic, spatial, and ecological context. He argued that the centralized industrial model of capitalism was not only exploitative but wasteful and unsustainable. Production should be localized, diversified, and responsive to the natural conditions and human needs of each community.

His anarchist communism called for the abolition of private property, not just in the means of production, but in the logic of accumulation itself. He believed in collective ownership of land, tools, and infrastructure, alongside decentralized production and free distribution of goods based on need. Unlike collectivist anarchists who favored remuneration based on labor, Kropotkin insisted that no person could accurately measure the contributions of another, and that attempts to do so would inevitably reproduce hierarchy. In this sense, he argued for the complete decommodification of life.

His scientific metaphors served a dual purpose: to legitimize anarchism against charges of impracticality, and to articulate a vision in which political freedom and ecological balance were not opposed but mutually reinforcing.

6.3 Decentralization, Cooperation, and the Architecture of Freedom

Kropotkin's political architecture was grounded in radical decentralization. He envisioned a world organized through voluntary federations of autonomous communes, cooperatives, and mutual aid associations. These would be linked not by coercive law or central command but by direct agreements and fluid networks of coordination. This vision applied equally to economic production, education, infrastructure, and dispute resolution. Authority would not be concentrated but distributed; power would not be held but rotated and contested.

This emphasis on decentralization was not merely structural. It was ethical and epistemological. Kropotkin believed that human dignity and creativity flourished when people governed themselves in communities small enough to practice direct democracy, and large enough to sustain diverse needs. He advocated for "integrated labor"—a model in which individuals would alternate between mental and manual work, scientific inquiry and practical action. In such a system, the division between intellectual elites and laborers would dissolve, removing the foundation for class domination.

Kropotkin also anticipated what we now call social ecology—the interdependence of social forms and ecological systems. He saw that centralized systems, whether capitalist or state socialist, would lead to ecological destruction because they alienated people from land, responsibility, and direct feedback from the natural world. His call for local, cooperative production was also a call to rebuild the metabolic relationship between society and nature.

In sum, Kropotkin offered a vision of freedom as non-domination through cooperation, rooted in the empirical reality of mutual aid, the moral imperative of equality, and the ecological necessity of decentralization. His work continues to inspire not only anarchist movements but also environmental thinkers, communal experiments, and modern mutual aid networks responding to crisis and catastrophe.

7. Errico Malatesta: Pragmatic Revolution and the Discipline of Organizing

Errico Malatesta (1853–1932) was a pivotal figure in the development of anarchist praxis, known for his ability to combine insurrectionary zeal with a realistic, disciplined approach to organizing. A lifelong revolutionary and prolific writer, Malatesta was arrested, exiled, and surveilled for most of his adult life. Yet he remained steadfast in his belief that anarchism must be both morally principled and strategically effective. Unlike some of his contemporaries who

leaned toward abstraction or spontaneous revolt, Malatesta insisted on the need for structure, continuity, and clear tactics. His work bridged the gap between philosophical anarchism and practical engagement, forming a legacy of revolutionary pragmatism that still shapes modern anarchist movements.

7.1 Insurrectionary Orientation Without Romanticism

Malatesta believed in the necessity of insurrection—moments of collective rupture against oppressive systems—but he rejected the romanticization of violence or chaos. For him, insurrection was a means, not an end. It had to be guided by a clear vision of liberation and a respect for the dignity of the oppressed. While he supported the idea that revolution often requires a break from the existing order, he was critical of "propaganda of the deed" when carried out in isolation or without mass support. Acts of symbolic violence, he warned, could alienate the public, invite state repression, and fail to build lasting alternatives.

Unlike those who glorified the moment of revolt, Malatesta emphasized the need to prepare the ground before and after such events. This meant building consciousness, organizing networks, and cultivating solidarity long before uprisings occurred. Insurrection, in his view, should emerge from collective will—not from elite conspiracies or desperation. He argued that anarchists should not merely wait for conditions to ripen but actively engage in creating the conditions for mass action, always with a realistic eye on the consequences.

7.2 Organization as a Safeguard Against Drift and Defeat

Perhaps Malatesta's most distinctive contribution to anarchist thought was his emphasis on organization—not as hierarchy, but as coordination rooted in shared purpose. He insisted that anarchist principles must be embodied in durable and coherent structures if they were to survive the pressures of repression, co-optation, and internal confusion. Disorganization, in his view, did not preserve freedom—it left movements vulnerable to fragmentation, manipulation, and burnout.

Malatesta envisioned anarchist organization as pluralistic and voluntary, but also committed and goal-oriented. He supported the creation of formal anarchist groups and federations that could engage in both propaganda and direct action, while maintaining internal democracy and transparency. His approach challenged the notion that anarchism meant pure spontaneity or refusal of structure. For him, disciplined organization was the only way to ensure that revolutionary movements remained accountable to their ideals and avoided reproducing informal hierarchies or inertia.

This orientation placed him in dialogue—and sometimes tension—with more anti-organizational anarchists. Yet his stance proved prescient in periods where anarchist movements succeeded temporarily, only to collapse from internal disarray or external pressure.

Malatesta's insistence on planning, cohesion, and shared strategy was not authoritarianism in disguise—it was a radical commitment to effectiveness without domination.

7.3 Reform, Compromise, and the Boundary Between Tactics and Surrender

Malatesta also confronted the difficult question of how anarchists should relate to reform movements and partial victories. He rejected the purist attitude that any engagement with non-revolutionary efforts amounted to betrayal. Instead, he advocated a tactical flexibility grounded in anarchist ethics. If a reform improved people's lives or opened space for further resistance—such as shorter work hours, free speech protections, or release of political prisoners—it was worth supporting. However, he warned that such engagement must never lead to ideological compromise or institutional dependence.

He drew a clear line between tactical participation and strategic assimilation. The purpose of engaging with reform, he argued, was to radicalize the participants, expand political horizons, and build capacity—not to win seats, join governments, or trade long-term goals for short-term visibility. Anarchists could collaborate with broader movements without surrendering their autonomy or becoming foot soldiers for liberal agendas. The real danger, in his view, was not reform itself but the loss of revolutionary direction when movements became entangled in state logic.

Malatesta's careful navigation of this boundary remains relevant in today's political climate, where anarchists must decide how to engage with electoral crises, protest movements, labor unions, and social reforms. His legacy is one of principled realism—recognizing the need to act in the world as it is, without giving up the vision of the world that could be. Through his nuanced understanding of insurrection, organization, and reform, Malatesta offered a model of anarchism grounded not in abstract purity, but in disciplined, humane resistance.

8. Emma Goldman: Personal Liberation, Speech, and Revolutionary Culture

Emma Goldman (1869–1940) stands as one of the most vivid and controversial figures in the history of anarchism. A fierce advocate for free speech, women's emancipation, and direct action, Goldman expanded the scope of anarchist politics to include dimensions of everyday life that had long been marginalized by both mainstream reformers and male-dominated radical movements. Her life of exile, arrest, and relentless public speaking turned her into a symbol of resistance and, at times, a scapegoat for anarchism itself. Yet behind the myth was a sharp and evolving thinker who refused to separate personal liberation from political struggle. She demanded not only the end of authoritarian institutions, but also the cultural and emotional transformation necessary to make freedom real.

8.1 Freedom as Lived Practice, Not Future Promise

Goldman was unsparing in her critique of political movements that promised liberation only after some future revolution. For her, freedom could not be postponed to the aftermath of a hypothetical insurrection—it had to be lived in the present, even under conditions of repression. She argued that revolutionary ethics meant embodying one's ideals in daily life, especially in the realms of love, speech, creativity, and conscience.

This insistence often placed her at odds with both socialists who prioritized state power and anarchists who focused narrowly on economic structures. Goldman championed a form of *anarchism of the soul*, in which dignity and autonomy began with individual acts of resistance to moral and cultural authority. Her lectures and writings emphasized that internalized repression—shame, fear, obedience—was as dangerous as external institutions. Thus, the personal was not a retreat from politics; it was the proving ground of any truly radical project.

8.2 Feminism, Sexuality, and the Critique of Respectability Politics

One of Goldman's most transformative contributions to anarchism was her integration of feminist and sexual politics into its core. She rejected both the Victorian ideal of passive womanhood and the narrow agendas of bourgeois feminists focused solely on suffrage or legal reform. To Goldman, women's liberation required more than the vote—it demanded sexual autonomy, economic independence, and the right to challenge every social norm that dictated how a woman should live, love, and express herself.

She was an early and vocal advocate of birth control, free love, and the right to pleasure—positions that scandalized many and provoked frequent arrest. She attacked the institution of marriage as a state-sanctioned form of bondage, especially for working-class women, and criticized motherhood as a role enforced by guilt and legal coercion rather than genuine desire.

Her critique extended beyond gender. She denounced *respectability politics* across the board, arguing that radicals who sought acceptance through conformity had already betrayed their cause. For Goldman, liberation required not only political and economic change but a cultural revolution that swept away shame, repression, and the internalized police of tradition.

8.3 War, Conscription, and the State’s Claim Over the Body

Goldman’s anarchism was shaped decisively by her opposition to militarism and the totalizing claims of the state over individual life. During World War I, she became a leading figure in the anti-conscription movement in the United States, helping to organize resistance through the No-Conscription League. She viewed war not as a tragic necessity but as the logical consequence of capitalism and nationalism—systems that sacrificed individual life for imperial profit and patriotic myth.

Her stance led to her arrest and imprisonment under the Espionage Act, and ultimately to her deportation in 1919. But her anti-war politics were more than a critique of foreign policy. They were an extension of her deeper belief that the state's most terrifying power was its capacity to seize the body—whether through military drafts, police violence, prison, or moral regulation. To Goldman, every assertion of state power was also an assertion over physical life: what one could say, where one could go, who one could love, and whether one could live or die.

Her resistance to war, therefore, was bound to her broader defense of freedom as bodily integrity and spiritual autonomy. Against the state's claim to patriotism, Goldman offered an ethic of human solidarity that rejected all borders, all wars, and all systems that required obedience unto death.

In sum, Emma Goldman expanded the field of anarchist politics into realms that many radicals considered peripheral or private. She taught that no revolution could be complete unless it liberated the intimate spaces of love, speech, and the self. Her vision remains one of the most radical and enduring challenges to any movement that forgets the soul in its pursuit of the system.

9. Alexander Berkman: Prisons, Punishment, and the Anatomy of Coercion

Alexander Berkman (1870–1936) remains a key figure in anarchist history not just for his activism, but for the depth of personal transformation he underwent and documented. A close comrade of Emma Goldman, Berkman's legacy is inseparable from his early attempt to assassinate industrialist Henry Clay Frick, his subsequent fourteen-year imprisonment, and his mature reflections on violence, justice, and liberation. Berkman's political development offers a window into the raw encounter between revolutionary conviction and the machinery of state repression. Through his writings—especially *Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist*—he turned his experience of captivity into a rigorous critique of carceral power, and a meditation on the moral challenges of revolutionary ethics under pressure.

9.1 Carceral Power as a Model of the State

For Berkman, the prison was not merely a place of confinement but a microcosm of state society. In his memoirs and later writings, he depicted prison not as a deviation from civil life but as its concentrated form—a distilled representation of hierarchy, surveillance, punishment, and the stripping of agency. Every routine, rule, and relationship within prison served to reinforce submission to external authority. The state, in his view, functioned on the same logic: it governed through control, conditioning, and the normalization of suffering.

This recognition led Berkman to reject reformist approaches to prison policy. He did not believe prisons could be made humane through better conditions or procedural fairness; their very existence was a denial of liberty. Like the wage system and the state, prisons were structural embodiments of coercion—designed to enforce compliance through fear and isolation. His vision of abolition was not limited to incarceration but extended to the broader architecture of domination in everyday life.

9.2 Radicalization, Remorse, and Political Maturation

Berkman's early political identity was shaped by the idea of *propaganda of the deed*—that a dramatic act of violence could ignite mass consciousness and inspire uprising. His attempted assassination of Frick in 1892 was intended as a revolutionary strike against capitalist tyranny. However, the years that followed—spent in solitary confinement, among common criminals, in silence and self-questioning—radically altered his understanding of both violence and political change.

Rather than retreat into cynicism or defensiveness, Berkman used the time to reflect deeply on his motivations, his disillusionment, and the human cost of abstract idealism. He did not abandon his anarchism, but he matured into a more grounded, empathetic thinker. He came to see that transformation required more than symbolic martyrdom—it demanded sustained organizing, cultural change, and a deep respect for the agency of those one hoped to liberate.

This process of internal evolution gave Berkman a rare moral authority among radicals. He was unflinching about his past, neither glorifying his act nor condemning his former self. Instead, he offered an honest account of learning through failure—a testament to the idea that political integrity requires continuous reflection, especially under duress.

9.3 Revolutionary Ethics Under Repression and Surveillance

After his release and eventual deportation following the First World War, Berkman remained politically active but wary of dogma. His experience with Bolshevism in Russia—initially hopeful, then deeply critical—reinforced his suspicion of authoritarian methods in the name of revolution. The violent suppression of dissent, the growth of political prisons, and the betrayal of workers' councils under the Soviet state confirmed his earlier warnings about the corrupting influence of centralized power.

Even under surveillance, impoverishment, and illness, Berkman continued to write, mentor younger activists, and articulate a moral framework for anarchist struggle. He defended the necessity of resistance but insisted that means must reflect ends. Violence used indiscriminately, or without accountability, would reproduce the same structures anarchists sought to abolish. He called for clarity of purpose, collective deliberation, and the rejection of actions that isolated revolutionaries from the very people they claimed to fight for.

In the face of repression, Berkman's ethics did not harden into purity but deepened into compassion. He understood that the state's power lay not only in brute force, but in its ability to deform human relationships, foster despair, and reward cruelty. Against this, he offered not just critique but example: a life that bore the scars of struggle, yet continued to seek dignity, empathy, and the fragile possibility of collective freedom.

10. Luigi Fabbri: Anti-Fascism, Authoritarian Drift, and Movement Self-Critique

Luigi Fabbri (1877–1935) was a lesser-known but deeply insightful figure within the classical anarchist tradition. A close collaborator of Errico Malatesta, Fabbri was notable for his acute political analysis, particularly regarding the rise of fascism and the internal contradictions that could weaken anarchist movements from within. Writing during the early 20th century, as Mussolini's fascist regime seized power in Italy, Fabbri developed a uniquely prescient critique of how crisis conditions could erode radical principles and how the structure of the state—even in revolutionary hands—remained a dangerous vessel for domination. His work offers one of the clearest articulations of the tension between revolutionary desire and authoritarian temptation.

10.1 Fascism as a Warning About Crisis Politics

Fabbri's analysis of fascism emerged not just from theoretical reflection but from direct experience in interwar Italy. He understood fascism as more than a political party or ideology—it was a sociopolitical phenomenon rooted in crisis. In the wake of World War I, with mass unemployment, political unrest, and widespread disillusionment, fascism offered order, identity, and revenge against perceived enemies. It channeled social anxieties into authoritarian nationalism, often with popular support.

Crucially, Fabbri warned that fascism could arise not only from the right, but from within the ashes of revolutionary failure. When leftist movements resorted to authoritarian tactics or sacrificed ethical coherence for expediency, they paved the way for reaction. Fascism, in his view, was a perverse mirror of revolutionary rhetoric—promising transformation while entrenching hierarchy. Its success revealed the dangers of imitating the methods of the state in the name of destroying it. Fabbri thus positioned anti-fascism not merely as opposition to a regime, but as a principled rejection of coercive shortcuts during periods of instability.

10.2 The State Form as a Recurring Temptation

Fabbri believed that the greatest threat to anarchist principles came not from external enemies, but from the internal lure of state power. He argued that the state was not simply a neutral tool to be wielded, but a structural and psychological force that shaped its users. The very form of

the state—its command hierarchy, bureaucratic inertia, and monopoly on violence—tended to reproduce itself regardless of who occupied its offices. Even well-intentioned revolutionaries, he warned, could be seduced by the apparent efficiency of centralized control, particularly under conditions of crisis or war.

This critique echoed Bakunin's earlier warnings but was sharpened by Fabbri's close observation of socialist and communist movements in Italy and Russia. He saw how appeals to temporary discipline, party unity, and "scientific socialism" often led to the suppression of dissent, the militarization of society, and the betrayal of revolutionary goals. Fabbri's emphasis was not on ideological purity, but on structural vigilance. If the goal was a world without domination, then even small compromises with state logic could have catastrophic effects. His insistence on examining the form, not just the rhetoric, of power remains an enduring lesson in movement ethics.

10.3 Lessons on Strategy, Narrative, and Institutional Capture

Fabbri also offered a sophisticated critique of how anarchist movements could unintentionally undermine themselves through strategic missteps, flawed messaging, or failure to guard against institutional capture. He was particularly concerned with the ways in which anarchist ideals were simplified or distorted by the press, misunderstood by the public, or diluted in alliances with other political currents. He called for a clearer articulation of anarchist values—not through slogans or dogma, but through consistent practice and ethical clarity.

He also emphasized the need for movements to reflect constantly on their own internal dynamics. Were decisions being made transparently? Were leadership roles becoming informal hierarchies? Were tactics reinforcing the very structures they aimed to dismantle? In this sense, Fabbri offered a model of movement self-critique—not as navel-gazing or paralysis, but as a safeguard against drift. He advocated building resilient cultures of dissent within anarchist organizations to prevent stagnation or dogmatism.

Finally, Fabbri's concern with *institutional capture*—how movements become absorbed or neutralized by the very systems they oppose—remains strikingly relevant today. He warned that as anarchists gained influence in unions, publications, or social movements, they risked adapting to the norms of those institutions rather than transforming them. Without constant ethical anchoring and structural humility, even the most radical movements could become absorbed by the machinery of power.

In sum, Fabbri stands out for his deep commitment to anarchist principles and his willingness to interrogate the vulnerabilities of revolutionary movements. His warnings about fascism, state form, and internal drift offer tools not only for historical reflection but for contemporary

resistance. In an age once again marked by authoritarian resurgence and political crisis, his insights remain both cautionary and constructive.

11. A Comparative Synthesis: What Converges, What Diverges

The anarchists examined in this study—Bakunin, Kropotkin, Malatesta, Goldman, Berkman, and Fabbri—shared a broad commitment to the dismantling of domination in its many forms. Yet they did not form a doctrinal unity. Their theories were shaped by their historical contexts, strategic choices, and personal transformations. What unites them is the core belief that freedom, equality, and cooperation must be constructed without the intermediary of the state or capitalist relations. What divides them are the methods and priorities by which that construction could or should take place.

11.1 A Matrix of Views: Organization, Economy, Violence, Culture

To appreciate both their convergence and divergence, it helps to visualize their positions along key axes of anarchist theory and practice:

- **Organization**:
  Bakunin emphasized secret cells and insurrectionary networks; Malatesta favored disciplined, transparent organizing; Goldman leaned toward individual autonomy within voluntary collaboration; Fabbri focused on long-term movement coherence and critique of institutional drift. Kropotkin saw federated communes as the primary unit. Berkman's late thought prioritized resilience over structure but retained organizational sympathies.

- **Economy**:
  Kropotkin's anarchist communism emphasized need-based distribution, while Bakunin's collectivism allowed for remuneration according to labor. Malatesta supported communism but stressed voluntary transition. Goldman and Berkman aligned with communism but framed economic freedom as part of a broader ethical vision. Fabbri contributed less to economic theory directly but echoed anti-capitalist consensus.

- **Violence**:
  Bakunin saw revolutionary violence as inevitable and even redemptive. Malatesta was skeptical of isolated violence but accepted insurrection as necessary. Goldman and Berkman evolved from support for "propaganda of the deed" toward a more reflective stance, warning against alienation and counterproductive tactics. Fabbri urged careful attention to the ethical and strategic consequences of violent means.

- **Culture and Ethics**:
  Goldman placed cultural revolution and personal freedom at the center of her

anarchism. Kropotkin grounded ethical cooperation in both science and tradition. Fabbri highlighted ideological clarity and public narrative. Berkman brought introspective ethics to the forefront, especially after his imprisonment. Malatesta maintained a firm boundary between ethics and tactics, without lapsing into dogmatism.

This matrix reveals that while their ultimate goals overlapped—abolition of coercive power, creation of free association, and radical equality—their emphases and tactical tolerances varied significantly.

11.2 Where Their Arguments Complement Each Other

Their ideas, though divergent, form a powerful constellation when read together. Bakunin's warning against revolutionary states complements Kropotkin's positive vision of decentralized cooperation. Malatesta's insistence on organization offers structure to Goldman's emphasis on individual freedom and lived ethics. Fabbri's analysis of fascism and political drift grounds the idealism of others in historical vigilance. Berkman's introspective evolution adds emotional and moral depth to discussions of violence and means.

These thinkers, taken together, offer a holistic anarchism—strategic and ethical, personal and structural, theoretical and practical. Where one stressed danger, another offered design. Where one erred toward zeal, another counterbalanced with discipline. Their complementarity is precisely what gives classical anarchism its resilience: no one model dominates, and the space for reflection remains open.

11.3 Where Their Disagreements Remain Structurally Unresolved

Despite these complementarities, there remain foundational disagreements that classical anarchism never fully resolved:

- **Economic Transition**:
  The question of whether to compensate labor based on input (Bakunin) or to abolish such distinctions entirely (Kropotkin) remains a tension. The concern is not only fairness, but the possible reproduction of class hierarchies under any labor-based remuneration system.

- **The Role of Organization**:
  The divide between those who feared formal structure as a gateway to bureaucracy and those who saw structure as necessary to avoid fragmentation remains unresolved. Malatesta and Fabbri insisted on structured organizing; others like Goldman leaned toward looser, affinity-based collaboration. The tension between efficiency and autonomy persists in contemporary movements.

- **The Ethics of Violence**:
  Their differences on the legitimacy, scale, and goals of revolutionary violence—especially in the face of repression—reflect divergent moral thresholds. These debates remain unresolved not only because of philosophical variation, but because of the unpredictable nature of real-world political crisis.
- **Cultural vs Structural Focus**:
  Goldman placed personal liberation and cultural transformation at the center, whereas others like Bakunin and Malatesta prioritized structural overthrow. The balance between internal revolution (of values, norms, and relationships) and external revolution (of laws, institutions, and economies) remains an ongoing dialectic in anarchist theory.

These unresolved tensions do not signal failure but reflect anarchism's refusal to impose a fixed doctrine. Instead, they signal an enduring effort to navigate the paradoxes of freedom, power, and human imperfection. Classical anarchism survives not because it solved all these questions, but because it demanded that we keep asking them.

12. Contemporary Relevance: Re-reading Classical Anarchism Today

The classical anarchist thinkers discussed in this paper—Bakunin, Kropotkin, Malatesta, Goldman, Berkman, and Fabbri—lived in radically different times, but their insights are not frozen in the 19th or early 20th centuries. Their frameworks—anti-authoritarian ethics, critiques of centralized power, mutual aid, and refusal of coercive hierarchy—have gained new relevance in the context of 21st-century struggles. As political, economic, ecological, and technological crises converge, new generations are rediscovering anarchist principles—not as dogma, but as a set of living practices and provocations.

12.1 Horizontalism, Networks, and Modern Movement Forms

The 21st century has seen a significant resurgence of **horizontalist** organizing models, from Occupy Wall Street to the global climate justice movement, indigenous land defense networks, and mass uprisings like those in Chile, Lebanon, Sudan, and beyond. These decentralized, leaderless movements mirror the federalist, non-hierarchical models envisioned by Kropotkin and Malatesta. Their reliance on consensus, rotating facilitation, and affinity groups demonstrates that formal hierarchy is not a prerequisite for coordinated action.

The rise of digital networks has also altered the terrain of anarchist praxis. While surveillance capitalism presents serious challenges, digital platforms have enabled rapid coordination, knowledge sharing, and direct communication that bypass traditional gatekeepers. In this

environment, classical anarchist suspicion of centralized authority aligns with a broader skepticism toward corporate and state control over information infrastructure.

Yet the vulnerabilities of horizontalism—fragmentation, unclear strategy, burnout—mirror the tensions that classical anarchists debated. Malatesta's insistence on organized coherence remains relevant, reminding contemporary movements that structure does not necessarily mean domination, and that coordination is essential for endurance.

12.2 Mutual Aid in Crisis Politics and Community Resilience

One of the most visible contemporary expressions of classical anarchist ideas is the widespread revival of mutual aid. In the face of state failure during the COVID-19 pandemic, economic collapse, natural disasters, and refugee crises, mutual aid groups emerged across the globe, providing food, medical supplies, housing support, childcare, and translation services. These efforts echoed Kropotkin's principle that solidarity, not charity, should form the basis of social cooperation.

Mutual aid as practiced today often draws directly on Kropotkin's language, and builds on the legacies of Black and Indigenous community organizing in the United States and Latin America. It offers an alternative to both state dependency and market extraction, and cultivates resilience and trust among those most abandoned by official institutions.

However, as with earlier periods, mutual aid efforts face challenges: co-optation by NGOs, surveillance, and burnout. The writings of Goldman and Fabbri remind us that without cultural transformation and sustained political strategy, mutual aid can be depoliticized and reduced to crisis management. Classical anarchism urges us to connect relief work with revolutionary transformation—not just mending the world, but rebuilding it on new foundations.

12.3 Speech, Policing, Prisons, and the Post-9/11 Security State

The expansion of surveillance, policing, and carceral power in the 21st century—especially following the events of 9/11—has reaffirmed the prescience of Berkman's critique of prisons and Goldman's analysis of state control over bodies and speech. From mass incarceration in the U.S. to predictive policing algorithms, facial recognition software, and domestic anti-terrorism laws, the modern state increasingly governs through what Berkman identified as carceral logic: discipline, separation, normalization of violence, and social containment.

Contemporary movements for **prison abolition**, community accountability, and police defunding reflect anarchist sensibilities: not just critiquing unjust policies, but rejecting the legitimacy of punishment as a social foundation. Goldman's defense of free speech—especially under wartime repression—and Fabbri's warning against narrative capture remain crucial in an age of algorithmic censorship, misinformation warfare, and shrinking public dissent.

The classical anarchist critique of the state as a *structure of coercion, not a neutral arbiter* resonates with those confronting the fusion of militarized policing, corporate surveillance, and homeland security. The question they all raised—how can freedom survive when security becomes a justification for everything?—remains deeply unresolved.

12.4 The Standing Challenge: Power That Returns in New Disguises

Perhaps the most enduring insight of classical anarchism is its vigilance toward the return of power in new forms. Bakunin warned that revolutionary states could become more tyrannical than the regimes they overthrew. Fabbri insisted that authoritarianism could re-emerge through crisis politics and even through revolutionary rhetoric. Today, these concerns are mirrored in how populist authoritarianism, nationalist socialism, and technocratic liberalism each claim to speak for "the people" while consolidating elite control.

In the era of platform monopolies, artificial intelligence, and corporate-state fusion, new forms of domination emerge that escape traditional categories. The gig economy, data extraction, predictive governance, and behavioral manipulation pose challenges that classical anarchists could not have predicted but would have recognized in spirit.

This is the standing challenge: to resist not only known enemies but novel, seductive forms of power—those that come wrapped in freedom, innovation, or even justice. The refusal to trade liberty for order, or ethics for efficiency, defines the classical anarchist position. Its relevance is not in offering ready-made solutions, but in cultivating a moral and political compass—a commitment to autonomy, dignity, mutuality, and the refusal to rule or be ruled.

As movements today seek to build the future in the shadow of collapsing systems, re-reading classical anarchism provides not a map, but a set of questions. How do we organize without domination? How do we defend without becoming what we fight? How do we live now what we wish for later? In asking them, we keep the anarchist tradition not only alive, but urgently necessary.

13. Conclusion: The Anarchist Test

The six thinkers explored in this paper—Mikhail Bakunin, Peter Kropotkin, Errico Malatesta, Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman, and Luigi Fabbri—did not agree on everything. They argued over economics, violence, organization, and the proper scope of revolutionary strategy. Yet running through all their work is a shared imperative: that the ends do not justify the means unless the means themselves *are* liberation. This principle, more than any specific blueprint, forms what we might call the anarchist test—a lens through which all revolutionary theory and practice must pass: *Does it reproduce domination, or does it dismantle it?*

13.1 The Standard: Does the Method Reproduce Domination

The defining anarchist insight is that domination has no rightful place, whether it wears the mask of law, tradition, expertise, or even revolutionary leadership. The method of social change, therefore, must be judged not by its efficiency or popularity but by its ethical consistency. Anarchism does not permit a revolutionary elite to rule in the name of the people, nor does it allow authoritarian measures to be excused by a promised utopia. For Bakunin, it was the state-form itself that needed to be abolished; for Goldman, it was the cultural norms that made people internalize their own oppression. For all six, freedom was not something to be decreed—it had to be practiced.

This test remains urgently relevant today. In social movements, political parties, non-profits, and even digital platforms, the question is the same: *Does the structure we are building prefigure freedom, or simply rearrange the chains?*

13.2 A Realistic Utopianism: Institutions That Cannot Harden Into Rulers

Classical anarchists were often accused of being utopian, yet their critiques are strikingly realistic in one crucial respect: they assumed that power will corrupt unless carefully structured not to accumulate. Their task was not to perfect human nature, but to build forms of life where even flawed, fallible people could live without dominating or being dominated.

Rather than abolish all coordination, they proposed federation, rotation, recallability, and local autonomy. Rather than reject all tools of resistance, they sought to wield them in ways that did not mimic the systems they opposed. This is what Malatesta meant when he warned that organization was necessary—but must be continually inspected for drift. It's what Fabbri meant when he argued that fascism grows from the soil of strategic shortcuts and unmet expectations.

In this light, anarchism is not a rejection of institutions but a demand for institutions that cannot ossify into authority—structures that dissolve when they outlive their usefulness, that serve rather than command.

13.3 What These Six Teach About Courage, Error, and Endurance

These six figures were not flawless icons but people who acted, often in haste, sometimes in error, but always from a position of fierce moral clarity. Bakunin's exuberant insurgency, Kropotkin's scientific optimism, Malatesta's tireless organizing, Goldman's cultural rebellion, Berkman's painful moral evolution, and Fabbri's strategic foresight—they form a composite portrait of revolutionary endurance.

They teach that courage is not just the willingness to resist, but the harder task of refusing easy victories that cost ethical integrity. They show that error—such as Berkman's youthful attempt at assassination or Goldman's early support for Bolshevism—can become the soil for deeper

insight, if one remains open to reflection and accountable to others. And they show that endurance—remaining loyal to principles even in exile, prison, or political defeat—is itself a form of revolutionary success.

In re-reading these six, we are not seeking prescriptions but provocations: a reminder that the work of building a free society begins now, in how we speak, organize, act, and refuse. The anarchist test remains a simple but unyielding standard: *Do we build what we claim to desire—or do we replicate what we claim to resist?* To ask this, again and again, is to keep anarchism alive—not as a doctrine, but as a practice of freedom.

14. References

14.1 Primary works by the six figures

Bakunin, Mikhail. Revolutionary Catechism. 1866.

Bakunin, Mikhail. The Paris Commune and the Idea of the State. 1871.

Bakunin, Mikhail. Statism and Anarchy. 1873.

Bakunin, Mikhail. God and the State. First published 1882.

Kropotkin, Peter. The Conquest of Bread. 1892.

Kropotkin, Peter. Fields, Factories and Workshops. 1899.

Kropotkin, Peter. Memoirs of a Revolutionist. 1899.

Kropotkin, Peter. Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution. 1902.

Kropotkin, Peter. Modern Science and Anarchism. 1903.

Malatesta, Errico. Between Peasants: A Dialogue on Anarchy. First published 1884.

Malatesta, Errico. Anarchy (L'Anarchia). 1891.

Malatesta, Errico. At the Cafe (Al caffè): Conversations on Anarchism. Often dated 1922 in collected form; composed/serialized over many years.

Goldman, Emma. Anarchism and Other Essays. 1910.

Goldman, Emma. My Disillusionment in Russia. 1923.

Goldman, Emma. My Further Disillusionment in Russia. 1924.

Goldman, Emma. Living My Life. 1931.

Berkman, Alexander. Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist. 1912.

Berkman, Alexander. Now and After: The ABC of Communist Anarchism. 1929.

Fabbri, Luigi. Bourgeois Influences on Anarchism. 1914.

Fabbri, Luigi. Dictatorship and Revolution. 1921.

Fabbri, Luigi. The Preventive Counter-Revolution. 1922.

Fabbri, Luigi. Errico Malatesta: His Life and Thought. Originally published 1936.

14.2 Readers, collected editions, and editorial scaffolding

Turcato, Davide, ed. The Method of Freedom: An Errico Malatesta Reader. Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2014.

14.3 Biographical and interpretive studies focused on the six

Cahm, Caroline. Kropotkin and the Rise of Revolutionary Anarchism, 1872–1886. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Ferguson, Kathy E. Emma Goldman: Political Thinking in the Streets. 2011.

Leier, Mark. Bakunin: The Creative Passion. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2006.

Richards, Vernon. Errico Malatesta: His Life and Ideas. London: Freedom Press, 1965.

Turcato, Davide. Making Sense of Anarchism: Errico Malatesta's Experiments with Revolution, 1889–1900. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012.

14.4 General overviews, handbooks, and orientation texts

Levy, Carl, and Matthew S. Adams, eds. The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism. 2019.

Ward, Colin. Anarchism: A Very Short Introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

14.5 Movement forms, labor, and organizing traditions

Rocker, Rudolf. Anarcho-Syndicalism: Theory and Practice. 1938. (Commonly cited foundational statement of syndicalist strategy and movement organization.)

14.6 State formation, prisons, crisis politics, and fascism as "stress tests"

Davis, Angela Y. Are Prisons Obsolete? New York: Seven Stories Press, 2003.

Eco, Umberto. Ur-Fascism (also known as Eternal Fascism). First published 1995.

Graeber, David. Fragments of an Anarchist Anthropology. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press, 2004.

Spade, Dean. Mutual Aid: Building Solidarity During This Crisis (and the Next). London: Verso, 2020.

The author has published over 4,900 AI-assisted papers at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.